

**From:** Sue James  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:40 PM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

NO, to deregulation of the media.  
Sue James  
7327 SW Barnes Rd #125  
Portland, OR 97225

**From:** R. & V. Pritchett  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:40 PM  
**Subject:** Media Monopoly

The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

If you needed proof of the shenanigans and selective black out of news for the people, survey how many media outlets alerted the public to this issue before today. The situation will deteriorate just as the local news radio stations. This will become a dictatorship of the moguls not the government of the people. Our civil liberties and our civil defense are at stake. (think ammonia disaster)

I would like to put the radio genie back in the bottle not let out another. Can we at least make sure the owners are American citizens. Wouldn't the terrorists with rich backers like 9/11 have fun.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Mrs. V. R. Pritchett  
El Sobrante, CA 94803-1627

**From:** Nancy Kegresse  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:45 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Nancy Kegresse (kegresse@att.net) writes:

Thank you for not supporting media deregulation. We don't want only a few to control so much. (Isn't that why the AT&T monopoly was broken up? Sounds like double standards to me!) Allowing only a few to control the media will take away the American public's right to hear both sides of any story which is how I perceive Communism to be. Stand by your beliefs and help America. Thanks.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 12.93.63.227  
Remote IP address: 12.93.63.227

**From:** Joe Needham  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:53 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protection that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

--- Joe Needham  
--- jcn123@earthlink.net  
--- EarthLink: The #1 provider of the Real Internet.

**From:** dischinger  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, budmail@mail.house.gov, budmail@mail.house.gov  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:54 PM  
**Subject:** Deregulation

Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and Congressman Cramer,

I am writing to express my most serious opposition to any further deregulation of the public airwaves. I understand a decision is to be made on this issue tomorrow. Throughout my life, I have been led to believe broadcast licenses were a national trust and to be utilized for the benefit of the interests of the citizenry. To that end, diversity of ownership would seem essential to assuring the widest variety of public discourse. This has been a guiding principle of media ownership regulation for decades. I cannot think why it would be beneficial to abandon this principle now. To argue that people have access to a wider variety of sources than they had when the regulations were established is specious at best. I cannot listen to the Internet when driving in my car. Furthermore, I do not look to the Net for reliable information; I take it for granted that most of what is there is not created by professional journalists. On the other hand, I take it on faith that the reporting media of print, radio, and television operate from at least a modicum of professionalism and professional ethics.

The trend of the last few years toward monopolistic ownership of radio and television licenses is, while an understandable goal for a large corporation, extremely dangerous to the principles of free expression upon which this country was founded. I will use but one, admittedly somewhat trivial, example the recent "boycott" of the Dixie Chicks. I am not a big fan of country music, and I surely don't look to these young women for political guidance. The issue, however, is their treatment by the Clear Channel conglomerate. The indications are that, corporate protestations notwithstanding, Clear Channel organized the "boycott." This is not, in itself, a travesty. Clear Channel owns the radio stations and has the right to choose which bands it will support. The travesty is that a single corporation has such power to influence public opinion. Had there been opposing voices, there would not have been such a brouhaha, but there were none. In many markets, Clear Channel is the eight hundred pound gorilla. The Dixie Chicks' silly pronouncements should never have seen the light of day. In most situations, even had their expression (which they were, as citizens, however ill-informed, entitled to make) made the news, they would have been forgotten in two days. Clear Channel, however, decided to make a public example of them. This is a case of a CORPORATION having a political agenda and using its power to intimidate individuals. In the Nineteenth Century, this was known as Yellow Journalism. Do we want history to repeat itself and have a new dawn of such behavior in the Twenty-first Century? I would argue the answer to that is "no." Again, the trend toward monopolistic ownership will surely lead us further in that direction.

I urge you in the strongest terms to reverse this trend, rather than let it go further. Do not, under any circumstances, allow corporations or individuals to own more than a very small number of television and radio stations. I am not a media expert, and I do not

know what this number is. However, I imagine that any individual (corporate or personal) who owned twenty television and radio licenses here in Alabama would have basically a stranglehold on public opinion, advertising fees, and music sales, if they were the "right" (that is to say, strategic) stations. Surely, twenty is too large a number; Clear Channel currently owns hundreds and aspires to complete monopoly.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,  
Charles Dischinger  
1114 Chesterfield Road  
Huntsville,  
Alabama 35803

CC: disch@hiwaay.net

**From:** Brian Lawrence  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Anne, awalton, ftag3, Joseph DeCaria  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:55 PM  
**Subject:** Media Monopoly

Dear Sir/Madame,

As a registered voter, a law-abiding citizen, and concerned American, I am asking you not to change the Broadcast Ownership Rules in the coming days on June 2.

It is not fair to allow the voices of powerful media giants to determine what viewpoints will be sent to the average citizen. If the broadcast rules are changed, then independent voices in cities across the U.S. would be shut out by a monopoly. News and important issues would all be slanted towards the viewpoint and beliefs of the monopoly.

It is not fair, that the FCC, controlled by five unelected officials, has conducted its decision-making process with only one public hearing and very little time for the public to react.

Many of the corporations fighting for these rule changes, like Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC, demonstrate a strong anti-gun bias in their new coverage.

Sincerely,

Brian M. Lawrence  
zork51@rcn.com

**From:** LESTER E WILLMORE  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 12:57 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership

We urge you not to change the existing rules and regulations pertaining to the ownership of TV stations, radio stations and/or newspapers. Over the years we have seen the disaster that deregulation has caused in the electrical power industry, the airline industry, and in the banking industry. Deregulation has caused too many headaches, trouble and problems and taxpayers too many dollars. Please vote NO.

Respectively,

Les & Jean Willmore  
12627 E. Nelson road  
Elk, WA 99009



**From:** Richard Prutow  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:07 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast ownership rules

I urge you not to relax the Broadcast multiple ownership rules.

Respectfully,  
Richard J. Prutow, Ph.D., M.D.

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).  
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

**From:** Katheryne Young  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:09 PM  
**Subject:** STOP MEDIA DE-REGULATION!!!!

Please preserve the integrity of our media. Stop consolidation by big companies, this will effect the quality, diversity and freedom of our public media and press. This is very important as our nation is beginning to look more and more like a facist regime.

Sincerely, Katheryne and Susan Young (UCSB and CSUCI, voters and citezens)

---

The new MSN 8: advanced junk mail protection and 2 months FREE\*  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

**From:** Katheryne Young  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:12 PM  
**Subject:** STOP MEDIA DE-REGULATION!!!!

Please preserve the integrity of our media. Stop consolidation by big companies, this will effect the quality, diversity and freedom of our public media and press. This is very important as our nation is begining to look more and more like a facist regime.

Sincerely, Katheryne and Susan Young (UCSB and CSUCI, voters and citezens)

---

The new MSN 8: smart spam protection and 2 months FREE\*  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

**From:** John E Beckman  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:14 PM  
**Subject:** Media mergers

Dear friends,

I work in the telecommunications industry (still!) and my wife is a former on air announcer. We are deply concerned about your willingness to allow more control by media moguls to dominate a higher percentage of the market. It will give too much power as to what is allowed/propogated in the media. When fewer people control this ability, the ability to push or limit an agenda is strengthened. THE AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE BEING AWARDED HERE IS NOT GOOD. PLEASE RECONSIDER! I have seen in the past the negetive results, and this would worsen things even more. Please.

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** James Booth  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:15 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

James Booth (FLLJimmB@earthlink.net) writes:

The issue in the Broadcast Ownership debate is diversity in LOCAL and STATE NEWS! There is NOT a huge variety of sources as there is for national news. Many cable systems don't even carry statewide or regional TV news networks, and NO satellites do.

The examples of radio dominance by a few owners in many markets PROVES YOU SHOULD NOT INCREASE THE TV OWNERSHIP LIMITS!

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 67.100.31.114  
Remote IP address: 67.100.31.114

**From:** Ed Detre  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:19 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership rules

I'm sending this e-mail to protest any relaxation of the rules opening up the total number of Cross-Ownership or Multiple Ownership of broadcast stations.

I feel the changes that were already made to the radio industry have not been good for anyone but maybe a select few owners.

Diversity is the thing that allows creativity, and these changes will do nothing but stifle it

Allowing so much control of media by such a select few is extremely dangers, please don't do this.

Thanks for listening

Edward Detre

**From:** Marisol Romero  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:20 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Marisol Romero (romero430@msn.com) writes:

Commissioner Adelstein,  
Tomorrow you will be faced with the challenge of whether or not to stand and defend a democratic and "free" media. As a citizen and voter, I urge that you consider the grievous consequences that will come from a corporate media monopoly. As a democratic society we cannot allow the greater good be determined by political and corporate gain.  
It is my hope that you will take to your vote the understanding that our society as we know it will change in an instance, once out of the control of truth.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 65.140.1.141  
Remote IP address: 65.140.1.141

**From:** Peter Jones  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:20 PM  
**Subject:** Proposed FCC Regulatory Changes

Dear FCC Chair and Commissioners,

I am writing to you regarding the changes to FCC regulations that you will be voting on tomorrow. I have deep reservations about the changes that are proposed and how they will effect our media in this country. I hope you will take a few moments to read my point of view and it will assist you all in coming to the most appropriate decision.

If the new regulations are passed as proposed, we, the American people, will lose yet another place where we can get objective and accurate news coverage. During these turbulent times, we need choice where we can get our news from and even as it sits at this time, media coverage of world and domestic events has become subjective and even jingoistic when it should be objective and thorough. I am singling out news coverage at this time because I see it as one of the most crucial areas that will be affected by having fewer corporations in control of our media. Personally, I cannot watch any of the major broadcasters news coverage due to its insufficient content. To illustrate this, just look at how this major story (the further deregulation of media ownership you are presently reviewing) is being covered by the major broadcasters (CBS, NBC, ABC and Fox): to put it simply, they are not covering it. The only sources of coverage that I have been able to find, and believe me, I search for news due to the inefficiencies of the major broadcasters, have been on PBS and NPR. To further this example, during the most recent conflicts in the Persian Gulf, I watched the coverage of the hostilities on the major broadcasters and then would switch over to coverage by the BBC and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, that we here in the North Country get through public broadcasting and cable, and seriously wondered whether the American broadcasters were covering the same story!!!

The major broadcasters in this country are not facing imminent bankruptcy if they do not get the changes presently before you. They have done a terrific job of horizontally diversifying their interests and as a taxpayer, I do not approve of this, another example of corporate welfare at the expense of so many other areas where we should be focusing our attention. For these reasons, I request that you vote not to approve these alterations to FCC rules.

Strangely enough, I'll be looking for coverage all over the media tomorrow night after your vote as I'm sure it will be well covered. The media will hail it as a victory if it goes through and as further government meddling if it does not!

Thank you for your time and attention in these VERY important issues.

Sincerely,

Peter W. Jones

8 Sebring Road



South Burlington VT 05403

**From:** VIRGILKEE@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:34 PM  
**Subject:** Proposed Change in FCC Regulations relative to RADIO

Dear Mr. Commissioner:

I wish to raise my objection to the relaxation of FCC regulations as they apply to multiple ownership of RADIO STATIONS. The following event in my local listening area will illustrate this point:

One longtime, locally-owned FM station in Manteo, North Carolina (WVOD-FM 99.1) was recently acquired by absentee owners, becoming a "Convergence Radio Station". This took place even though there was already such a station in nearby Elizabeth City, NC, whose signal reaches this area with full fidelity.

What this has spelled here on the Outer Banks is:

1.) The loss of the ONLY station in the area which carried NETWORK NEWS (CBS) on the hour. This news service is a major, worldwide news gathering organization and offers immediacy of coverage of major events that is second to none in radio. This station now provides some sort of State and Local coverage (ONLY) "in the mornings" and lasts only 4+ minutes. After about 10:00 A.M. One has to go elsewhere. There is now NO RELIABLE SOURCE of National and International news on local radio for the remainder of the day, nor in the evening.

2.) The loss of the only CLASSICAL MUSIC source on the Outer Banks. The usual program which ran on Sundays (6:00 A.M. - 1:00 P.M.) has been cancelled in favor of the everyday ROCK and ROLL format featured on all the other FM stations (that do not feature COUNTRY or R&B).

These losses occurred EVEN WITHOUT the revision of FCC regulations. Just consider what ADDITIONAL LOSSES could take place with your proposed changes!

**From:** Eleanorc21@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:35 PM  
**Subject:** (no subject)

JUNE 1ST  
DO NOT LIMIT THE NUMBER OF RADIO STATIONS THAT AN INDIVIDUAL CAN OWN OR A GROUP  
CAN OWN.  
ELEANOR RICE

**From:** pam  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:41 PM  
**Subject:** Review of FCC rule changes needs more time

Commissioners,

I urge you to delay voting on the relaxation of FCC controls over media ownership until more discourse can occur. This is too important an issue to be decided quickly. I am aware that there is much opposition to these changes and that side must have a chance to be heard.

My personal view is that I am not convinced of the need to relax any of the current media ownership rules. A relaxation of these controls does not seem to be in the benefit of the American people. Media must remain under diverse and decentralized control to ensure the democratic process.

Please delay Monday's vote, in the name of public debate.

Sincerely,  
Pamela Davis  
San Francisco

**From:** Bruce Smith  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:42 PM  
**Subject:** media ownership restrictions

Dear Commissioner.....Just because the general public does not constantly lobby you and try to influence you with trips and gifts and God knows what other tatics, don't think we will sit idly by as you give away the public airways to these greedy media mogals! This NOT why you are sitting on the FCC board. You are there for the good of the general public....not BIG BUSINESS!

**From:** Robert Annear  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:48 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership

Dear FCC,

Please reject the proposed changes to media consolidation. Americans are already experiencing a lack of choices in media options and who controls our news and entertainment. If these new rules are approved Americans will have even less choices in what we can listen to and watch. As the current media situation exists I already have limited choices in acquiring news and information on issues I care about. My entertainment choices are limited and it seems like most of the information released from media has been connected through joint contracts and consolidation. Our media is currently lacking in independence and these current regulations will only make the situation worse by providing an environment where there is even less independence and diversity in our media.

Please please please DO NOT APPROVE these regulatory changes. Thank you.

Robert L. Annear Jr.  
2520 NE Couch St., Apt#4  
Portland OR, 97232

**From:** Fran Mills  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:49 PM  
**Subject:** June 2 FCC Vote

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

A free, independent, and diversified press (i.e., multiple competing owners) is a vital cornerstone of our democracy. Media ownership consolidation brings with it inherent dangers. Where would minorities and minority points of view find a voice without a competitive media marketplace?

If the FCC rules in favor of easing ownership restrictions, it will affect all of us -- Republicans and Democrats alike -- because ultimately it will undermine our democracy by allowing a powerful few to control the information and editorials we receive. And, by making the big, bigger, it will become increasingly difficult for small, independents to get into the news and information marketplace.

This ruling will, in effect, give the news business to those corporations that are huge today, enabling them to get even bigger, while putting potential competitors at a great disadvantage -- and that is bad for all of us.

In the final hour I hope the members of the FCC will put aside politics and vote as citizens concerned with the public good and consider the legacy they leave for future generations. Please vote NO to media ownership consolidation.

F. Mills

Baltimore, MD

**From:** M3 Sweatt  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:54 PM  
**Subject:** Comment on media ownership

Dear Commissioners:

I would humbly submit to you that the Federal Communications Commission's proposal to relax media ownership rules will lead to dramatic consolidation of the two most important sources of news for much of the United States' citizens and residents. It is my belief that the FCC's proposal limits the amount of emphasis on local and meaningful issues that national and local media would cover, and further that it provides less protection for media mergers than our antitrust laws do for corporate mergers.

Your view on the subject should be influenced by greater analysis on the subject and with a nod toward the more than 18,000 views presented to the FCC, some in the limited public comment your agency has sponsored and even less than the media has covered. Key First Amendment principles should be enveloped in your decision not to support relaxing media ownership, and the FCC should not bend to any political agenda. It should serve the good and the will of the people, and for the benefit of the people.

Contrary to your view that the Federal Appeals court rulings say that the current media ownership restrictions lack sufficient legal basis, I would disagree. It is apparent that in the lack of exposure this major issue has received has less to do with the public's apathy or lack of interest, but more to do with the media's view of how your actions would affect their bottom line.

In the reports from several consumer's agencies (such as the Consumer's Union and Consumer Federation of America), I have found that the draft order ignores audience size, actual patterns of media use and the dramatic difference between entertainment and the dissemination of news and information. The CFA/CU analysis shows that mergers would be allowed in 140 concentrated local markets. In as many as 100 of these local markets, representing nearly half the national population, there is one dominant newspaper. Allowing a merger between a dominant newspaper and a large TV station would create a local news giant that threatens alternative news viewpoints. In these markets, one firm would have half of the total audience and employ half the total news employees.

The four major television networks get their profits by putting their nationally-oriented programming in front of the largest national audience possible, which maximizes advertising revenue. These companies therefore have no incentive to support or promote locally oriented programming that may be more interesting and more useful to a particular community at a particular point in time.

It is critical that these national companies not be allowed to be so large through ownership of too many local channels that they can dictate programming that does not meet the needs and tastes of the local community. Clearly, local broadcasters with no national profit-maximizing motives are better positioned to be responsive to their local communities.

The CFA/CU report points out that the FCC's mistake in opening markets to cross-ownership mergers is not limited to small rural areas. One-paper cities include Atlanta, Louisville, New Orleans, and San Antonio. In these localities the media giant would have a 90 percent or larger share of the newspaper circulation and a merger would also typically secure one-third of the TV audience. No second entity could come close to matching this media power. In typical two-newspaper markets (such as Buffalo, Las Vegas, Little Rock, and Richmond) the dominant paper still has, on average, five times the circulation of the number two paper. A merged firm would have four-fifths of the newspaper market, and one-third of the TV market.

I agree that public policy should err in favor of more competition rather than less so communities can



enjoy a greater diversity of viewpoints so critical to democratic dialogue and debate. We already are beginning to see this detrimental effect in the incredible homogenization of American radio, where two companies effectively control the bulk of programming in the country.

This broadcast ownership cap, one of six rules that your Commission will review tomorrow, is critical to the independence and diversity of our nation's media. The FCC should uphold these values and view, in support of the American people which your Commission serves, and not relax these rules. I trust that you have not lost sight of that simple truth.

Sincerely,

M. E. Sweatt, III

542 Bay Road

Menlo Park, CA 94025 2304

**CC:** msweatt@microsoft.com, FCC FCCINFO

**From:** KarenBPaul@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:54 PM  
**Subject:** Concerns about MB Docket #02-277, MB Docket #01-235, and MB Docket #01-317

Sunday 01 June 2003

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am not writing as a member of an organization but as an individual deeply concerned about the prospect of the media becoming larger. I am an active consumer of print, audio, televised, and Internet media. As I have seen the parent organizations grow larger, I have also seen a homogenization of the news and music occur. We are a country of diversity, and our news and music ought to reflect the views and styles of that diversity. If the Commission votes to allow organizations to hold even more companies, I foresee media diversity diminishing in favor of material that appeals to a particular, profitable, large market.

We have an amazing culture in our country. Please don't allow media conglomerates to expand any more and minimize our diverse perspectives.

Thank you for your attention,

Karen B Paul  
3101 Deibel Ct  
Louisville KY 40220

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, jadeste@fcc.gov

**From:** Dean Reiman  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:59 PM  
**Subject:** Media Consolidation

Mr. Powell,

We are writing to urge you not to allow the further consolidation of America's media. We are already overwhelmed by homogenized news and entertainment broadcasts; the move to allow for more corporate consolidation of ownership will only result in less diversity, fewer options and loss of local relevance.

Please, represent the people you were hired to serve, not the forces of corporate greed that are trying to rule this great country.

Dean and Pat Reiman  
PO Box 995  
Cannon Beach, OR 97110  
503.436.1100

---

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.486 / Virus Database: 284 - Release Date: 5/29/2003

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Stephen  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 1:59 PM  
**Subject:** Please oppose proposed changes that would allow even greater control of a radio market by a single o

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

I am concerned about the proposed changes, scheduled to be discussed in a meeting tomorrow, that would allow a single owner to gain control of an even greater share of an area's media "market" (radio, television, newspapers, magazines).

For example, for years AM radio listening has been sort of a background hobby interest for me. I still have fond memories of tuning up and down the AM radio dial as a child, finding out what stations I could discover. Each new station had the real possibility of offering something new and different and perhaps even unique. There really was different programming offered on the different stations!

I've probably dated myself already (I'm 46 years old) - you're probably already aware that the radio landscape hasn't been like what I just described for quite a few years already. Now, when I tune the dial, it's not unusual for me to pick up the same broadcast at several points on the dial. Isn't this clearly a waste of spectrum space?! I now hear less diversity in the kinds of programming that are out on the airwaves, and hear mostly similarity rather than diversity in the perspectives that are offered.

I believe that consolidation of ownership will \*inevitably\* lead to this kind of homogenization of content, and I think it creates the potential for a very serious problem. Our system of government is supposed to be based on the consent of informed voters (hence the emphasis placed on freedom of the press, etc.). True diversity in the public media is essential for the health of our country. I think things have already been going in the wrong direction, and the proposed changes simply take us further down the wrong road.

I think a strong case could be made for not having more than 1 station owned by a given owner in a given region! If that owner has a genuine desire to offer a variety of programming, that can be accomplished by a schedule rotation so that different programs are offered on different days or different timeslots, etc. If that owner guesses right, and truly does offer what people want, then people will choose to tune their radios to that station, and it won't matter that the owner has only one antenna in a given region - 1 would be enough.

Admittedly, perhaps I'm taking an extreme position just to make my point - the number may need to be greater than 1, but any increase should have to be justified. The burden should be on the owner to demonstrate that they don't have enough bandwidth to a given region to offer the full diversity of programming that they have to offer. And even then, there need to be tight limits, because a broadcaster could easily crank out a great "diversity" of programs that were ALL not inconsistent with that broadcaster's agenda. There really must be diversity of ownership (not just diversity in programming) in order to ensure that the public gets to hear many perspectives on a single issue, not just many issues all spun the same way.

The airwaves are a PUBLIC RESOURCE, and I believe that the FCC is under an obligation to make sure that that resource is allocated in ways that allow the public's interests to be well served. THE PUBLIC IS SPEAKING! I thank you for listening.

Sincerely,  
Stephen Klein  
Harvard, Massachusetts

**From:** Duncan Wheatley  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:00 PM  
**Subject:** media ownership

Dear Madam,

I encourage you to vote against extending limits on ownership of multiple media outlets. There is already too much monopolistic sameness in television, radio, and print.

Sincerely,  
Duncan Wheatley  
3506 Pear Tree Ct #11  
Silver Spring MD, 20906

**CC:** wheatleydp@netscape.net

**From:** Eddie Taylor  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, Jun 1, 2003 2:05 PM  
**Subject:** Serve the American.

It is your duty to serve the AMERICAN PUBLIC. All politics aside, I feel YOU SHOULD VOTE AGAINST THE CHANGES TO THE FCC RULES, allowing the large MEDIA COMPANIES TO CONTROL A MAJORITY OF ALL MEDIA SOURCES IN ANY GIVEN AREA OF THE USA.

Eddie Taylor  
Carson City, NV 89701

**CC:** Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps